THE

WEEKLY INSPECTOR.

" Of those men who have overturned the Liberties of Republics, the greatest number
" have begun their career by paying an obsequious court to the People—com-
" mencing DEMAGOGUES, and ending TYRANTS." HAMILTON.

Vol. II.] NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 22, 1807. [No. 52.

MONITOR.

No. XV.

" My aim is to bring this matter into more public discussion. Let the sagacity of others work upon it. It is not uncommon for medical writers to describe histories of diseases very accurately, on whose cure they can say but very little." BURKE.

It has been our object in the preceding numbers, to prove that the *politicians* of the French revolution were not deluded by the hum of liberty and equality; that they contemplated at the commencement of their tremendous contest, nothing less than to extend the power of France over the whole civilized world; that the principles of the French revolutionists were diffused for the purpose of paving the way for French conquests; that Bonaparte himself is under the dominion of the *sect* of politicians, the Talleyrands and the Sieyes of the revolution; that their emissaries, their Genets and Fauchets, have been active in the United States, sowing dissention between the federal government, while under the administration of Washington and Adams, and the people; that Mr. Jefferson imbibed his hostility to commerce in France, from his acquaintance with Condorcet and other philosophers of the revolution, and since that period his conduct has been diametrically opposite to his own precepts and political maxims, as laid down in his Notes on Virginia, written before he went to France; that his giving the signal for the destruction of the Federal navy, the abolition of direct taxes, the gun-boat and dry-dock measures, and, in short, every mean which has been used for reducing America to its present defenceless state, was the consequence of the intrigues of France; that this opinion is corroborated by the circumstance of the party in favour of France maintaining one system of measures as proper for France, but a totally opposite system for surrounding nations: France they would have a great military nation; but the French party in every other country strenuously, and in America successfully, have opposed military measures or preparations.

I know that some of our politicians who have a high opinion of their own wisdom, will declaim against my discussing these objects, as remote and uninteresting. What have we to do with France? Let Europeans fight their own battles. If France injures us, we will seek redress. If Great-Britain displays a hostile spirit, we will put ourselves in battle array against Great-Britain;

" We are a world by ourselves, and disdain
" a division,"

with other similar sentiments.

I should, indeed, have thought it impossible for men who possessed a " speck " of information, united with a grain of common sense, to reason in this way, were I not every day the reluctant auditor of political harangues of this kind. It surely cannot escape the penetration of our political sages, that the power which eventually predominates in Europe will predo-

minate in America, unless we change immediately our men and measures; the augean stable of democracy, by some greater than a Hercules be thoroughly cleansed, and we become in every deed, like France, a nation of soldiers. If the powers now combined against France are unable to oppose effectual resistance, it would be madness for America, under her present circumstances, to contend. Shall we then say that we have nothing to do with Europe? That it is a matter of indifference whether Bonaparte is driven back within the borders of France, or marches triumphantly to Petersburgh, or successfully invades England? Indeed, men who reason in this way, are such stuff as slaves are made of, and have no more foresight than the herd of beeves which suffer themselves to be quietly driven to a slaughter-house.

As respects the necessity of preserving a balance of power, we shall quote a sentiment or two from a celebrated writer:

"It does not admit of a doubt that the foe to society would long ere now have accomplished its destruction, if he had not met with the most determined and vigorous resistance from Great-Britain: And such, alas! is his present ascendency, that if our resistance were to be withdrawn, the whole of Europe would lie at his mercy. To deprive him of that ascendency, or in other words, of the ability to effectuate, when no longer opposed by us, his unabated purpose of universal subversion, is therefore essential to the general security, and consequently to the security of each individual state. But this can be done only by a restoration of the balance of power, for nothing else can enable the continent to resist his future attacks. If we were to make peace on terms the most advantageous to Great-Britain, separately considered, that our love of glory could desire; if insulating ourselves from our neighbours, we could prevail on the enemy to treat with us on the principle of *uti possidetis*, and to leave us in full possession of all our colonial acquisitions, immense as they are, we should not thereby avert destruction from the rest of Europe, nor ultimately from ourselves. For no colonial acquisitions made by us would, while we should be in a state of peace with the French republic, prevent the progress of revolution on the continent; nor when that progress should be completed, preserve us long from the fury of the enemy, who would then have it in his power, with a single hand, to direct the whole force of the continent against us: and it is absurd to suppose, that if the safety of Europe cannot induce us to continue the war, it would impel us to the infinitely more difficult operation of re-assuming hostilities after they had been terminated."

That France should so generally prove superior to her enemies in the field, will cease to astonish, when we reflect on the ardour with which she has cultivated the art of war, and the sciences with which it is connected. This was likewise a part of their grand system; and the nation which does not mean to bow to her yoke, must in this respect, imitate her. A portion of the youth of America should devote themselves to the profession of arms. The military character ought to be held in estimation in proportion to the importance of the duties devolving on the defenders of our country. A military life, instead of being, as is too frequently the case, the last resort of the idle and the dissolute, ought to be considered as the high road to honour and preferment.

The schools founded by the revolutionists were,

The Polytechnic School,
The School of Mines,
The Artillery School,
The School of Military Engineers,
The Bridge and Road School,
The Geographical School,
The School for Naval Architects,
The Navigation School, and
The Marine School.

In these schools were educated, the officers who have led the French armies through their career of conquest. Bonaparte himself learned the art of war in the Artillery School. To the science obtained in these schools may, in a great measure, be attributed the superiority of the French in the field, and their highly improved system of tactics.

The most enthusiastic valour is no security against the cultivated ardour

and consummate skill of leaders thus educated. The ardent Swiss, the disciplined Prussian, the hardy and persevering Russian, vanish like the mist of morning, before armies appointed and officered by such scientific and experienced leaders. Bewrayed by manœuvres which they cannot comprehend, they soon lose all confidence in themselves, while their opponents, conscious of their own superiority, march to the field with that assurance which is the prelude and pledge of victory.

"In France," says a French writer, "the art of war, which engrosses all the tributes of the sciences, and grasps at all the progresses of the human understanding, has caused new risks to be run, occasioned new experiments to be made."

And speaking of the conquest of Switzerland, the same author observes:

"When means have been found to climb the frozen summits of the Alps, and to forward bodies of troops and artillery along paths hardly trodden by the most intrepid sportsmen; the great plans of attack and defence are soon executed, as nature had herself linked the middling acclivities and heights to the chains and principal masses. Her secrets have been discovered; her immutable order has been recognized, even in her most whimsical caprices; to the chaos of the Great Alps a clue has been found; topographical maps have been perfected, the most minute details collected, and localities with an art and precision heretofore unknown. The exact knowledge of the grand conformation, of the *osteology* of the mountains, (if we may be allowed the expression,) has inspired generals and staff officers with ideas more grand and more simple. Roads of communication more beaten have been examined with greater attention. In short, a new topographical scale has been established for war-like operations in mountainous countries; and generals have ventured to detach corps to greater distances, in order to secure a commanding position, which made them masters of large spaces of ground."

These were some of the advantages derived from the military science of the French, and without such *science* it should seem that no degree of bravery can avail against a modern French army. It was science, the consequence of military schools, which enabled the French to triumph over the brave and unfortunate Swiss. And in consequence of tactics taught in French schools, France has effected more in years in her progress to universal empire, than Rome was able to perform in centuries.

That Bonaparte has in view the conquest of America, there can be no doubt. Ambition has no limits, but the extent of the globe. The pupils of revolution in the military schools of France, have already marked out the departments or provinces of a French government in America. France has her spies here; the topography of every part of our country is studied and understood in France, with a view to military expedition; and the same means which destroyed the brave Swiss, in spite of what they deemed the impregnable barriers of the Alps, will be employed by the same power against the United States.

It will eventually be necessary for America, if she would preserve her independence, to meet in arms the terrible power which is laying waste the old world. Our militia officers, and even those who, as the expression is, have seen *continental service*, will be easily out manœuvred by the Massenas and Bernadottes of the revolution; and the sooner we prepare for the tremendous contest, the fairer our hopes of success.

When we reflect on the immense power and resources of the French empire; that the continent of Europe is already little better than at her feet; that England will soon most probably be under the necessity of maintaining the contest single-handed with all Europe and part of Asia; and that America in that case cannot remain neuter, but must submit to the conqueror, or meet him in arms, we are really astonished and afflicted at the apathy of our countrymen. One would suppose that all minor considerations of party would be merged in the great inquiry, by what means shall we preserve our independence amid the wreck of nations? What mounds

shall we oppose to the torrent which has whelmed the fairer part of the old world? If we intend to be so "mindful of the cost," as to make no effort to save ourselves, let the principle be understood, and let us act in concert; for isolated efforts of patriotism will never avail. Those who still contend, notwithstanding the late defeat of Russia, that we have no interest in European concerns; that Europe can fight her own battles; that America is so happily situated as to be exempt from the calamity; act a part as absurd as it would be in the inhabitants of a part of New-York to feel no solicitude for extinguishing a conflagration which was desolating the other. You have no party wall nor fire engine, and yet you look quietly on. Your neighbour's dwelling is more immediately exposed, and him you will not assist, because you have a pique of many years standing against him. Therefore, instead of flying to his assistance, you plant yourself at your own door, and amuse yourself with his distress, not considering that the destruction of the intervening dwelling, will give additional strength and fury to the flames; and renders your own fate inevitable.

LITERARY.

Persons engaged in the business of tuition will receive with considerable interest a new work from the popular and classical pen of LINDLEY MURRAY. Its title is as follows: "*Introduction au Lecteur Francois, ou, Recueil de pieces choisies, avec l'explication des idiotismes, et des phrases difficiles, qui s'y trouvent.*"

The author informs us that he has been frequently solicited to publish a work which might serve as an introduction to his *Lecteur Francois*, and be calculated for the use of persons who are *beginning* to learn the French language. In an Appendix to his selection of pieces, Mr. MURRAY, who in this, as in all his other publications, confers on himself the humble epithet of "compiler," has given the meaning in English of the idiomatic and difficult phrases which are contained in the book. This plan he conceives to be greatly preferable to that which explains the words individually. His reasons, which he dwells upon at considerable length, appear to us conclusive. Our "compiler's" translation of the phrases is, as might have been expected, in *correct* English, such as will eminently tend to improve the language of young persons. As in every other work of this excellent author, the greatest attention is paid to the morals of the student: not a sentiment has been admitted which can hurt the most delicate mind; and in many of the pieces piety and virtue are placed in the most amiable and attractive points of view. Such a caution in the pursuit of the *French* language, is highly important. Every avenue to the flowery fields of the literature of that nation, should be guarded with peculiar care. Happy indeed would it have been for the civilized world, had it known no more of French morality than will be found in the selections of Lindley Murray.

The present publication, we doubt not, will rank with his most useful productions, more especially, as we understand that a book of this particular character, calculated more for the younger class of learners than his *Lecteur Francois*, has long been a desideratum. The publishers of Mr. Murray's different works in our city, if they have not already put it to press, will do well to set about it, and give to the public an handsome American edition.

FROM THE BOSTON CENTINEL.

PACIFICUS.

No. V.

WAR!—Will it be *profitable*, or rather—Will it not be *ruinous?*

Fellow-citizens,

It is said, that we have ten times as much specie as we had during the last

war.---This is a most extravagant and ridiculous calculation. Our capital, however, is *doubtless vastly* increased, but we have extended our system of credit, or rather we nave created one which did not before exist; and all our increased wealth is *either* put at hazard, and will go to *enrich* our enemy, and enable her to carry on the war, or it has been vested in improving our houses, in articles of luxury and expense, which in place of affording us real aid in carrying on the war, will impoverish as well as humble us. Besides, our unexampled prosperity produced by neutrality and peace, has induced habits of luxury and expense in living, has created wants which we shall not be able immediately to shake off or to satisfy. These habits render us less able to carry on a war than we were formerly.

A large proportion of our wealth too is ideal, at least so far as respects our means of carrying on a war. It will in such an event disappear, and melt away "like the baseless fabrick of a vision." To make this familiar to every citizen by examples.—Our neighbour is said to be worth 50,000 dollars.---His property consists of 20 thousand dollars marine insurance stock, and 80 thousand dollars six per cents. This last is a sum due from the nation to the individual.---Let a war annihilate, as it would, our revenue:---Let it create wants more imperious than the rights of the public creditors, the interest of the public debt is suspended. What becomes of our rich neighbour? Why he must starve or beg. Can he then pay taxes, can he support the war? No---all his property must be then thrown out of the estimate of our means. And pray, what an immense proportion of our boasted wealth is of this nature? Again, the owners of house, stores and farms, may think their wealth more stable---that it will not fluctuate with war or peace. They deceive themselves.---It is liable to as great changes as well as the propery of the merchant.---It has been very justly remarked, that a house covered a family as well in 1788, and that a farm as well cultivated produced at that time as much as now; and yet they are now worth three or four times as much money as they were at that time. We estimate the wealth of our country by the present value of all its real and personal estate.---Destroy or very much diminish its personal property, and the real estate instantly loses a great part of its exchangeable value. A mechanick who owns one or two good houses in Boston, thinks himself worth 20,000 dollars. Let a war take place which should diminish the demand for houses, and lower the rents, and instead of 20,000 dollars his property will fall to 5000. His ability to pay taxes will lessen in proportion, and of course the means or resources of the nation, which are made up of the aggregate means of the individuals, will likewise be diminished.

Again—a large propoporition of what we call the wealth of individuals, is composed of debts due from one individual to another of the same community. It is apparent, that this does not enter into the amount of national means. If it did, the bankruptcies, dimunition of personal property by captures, and other losses, would essentially lessen this species of wealth. In short, no man in the community can flatter himself with an exemption from the common calamity; it will pursue and overtake him, however cautiously he may be entrenched.

But, says the Intelligencer, we have national credit, on which the government may draw to an almost unlimitted amount. Is it possible that a man can be so absurd? On what facts or data can such a confidence be founded? Rich as we boast ourselves, we own but one quarter of our own debt.---Nearly three quarters of it are owned in England.---Will England, in case of war with her, trust us? Will the poor, squeezed, impoverished Hollanders trust us? Can Spain trust us, or will she be disposed? Or do we rely on the coffers of France, so full, and on which there are so few claims? But our own citizens who cannot afford

even in peace, to own more than one fourth of our domestic debt, are to be the leaders, it will be said. Under what encouragement? Because our government will have so much revenue in case of war? Because our landholders pay taxes so cheerfully, and our southern ones so speedily? Because the interest was so punctually paid during the last war? Because all the lenders were then obliged to sell at 26 shillings in the pound? Because Hamilton with all his talents could not venture to propose the payment of more than two thirds of the principle of the old debt? Because the Virginians, who now govern the country, have so high a respect for public credit, and have done so much to support it? Because Mr. Wolcott could not borrow under eight per cent. in a time of peace?----Who are to be the leaders? Not the farmers, it is presumed. Their farms and their cattle are not convenient subjects for a loan. Not the merchants, they are admitted by the Intelligencer to be the only subjects of ruin in case of war. Not the money holders, because they have already invested nearly their all in the public funds; and they will feel so severely the effects of war to be willing to hazard more. With what face can those who have been the avowed enemies of public credit----who have censured and turned out their predecessors principally for supporting it, venture to assert that the government may draw upon their credit to an almost unlimitted amount? It may be safely affirmed, that unless Bonaparte's scheme of *forced loans* be adopted, not one shilling will ever be loaned to the United States, even if the war should be a popular one.

But our merchant ships are to be all converted into letters of marque and reprisal, and to supply us better than they do now.----Bravo! This exceeds any of the wonderful transformations of Harlequin.----A dull sailing merchant ship into a fast sailing privateer which shall not only catch all the British merchant vessels, but run from their frigates!!! This may do for the yahoos and backwoods men of Virginia, but will not answer for the understanding of the citizens of the commercial Eastern States. We remember too well the events of the last war to be deceived by such arguments.----No.---- If we could get our merchantmen in, we should be lucky;----but even if they could answer for letters of marque, it would cost nearly as much to fit them out, as to build new ones; and when fitted out, they would serve only to furnish our enemy with guns and ammunition, and to recruit his ships with our seamen. The records of our Admiralty court last war, (with which the writer of this piece is well acquainted) will shew, that after Great Britain had learnt to fear us, and to understand how we were to be fought, our privateering served only to recruit her maine, and to enrich her coffers. Every man who persevered in the busines lost in the last years of the war, the greater part of what he gained in the brmer. Great Britain has now double the number of ships of war which she had during the last war, and noenemies which she cannot control on the ocean. Then she had formidable enemies who kept the sea in spite of her, and gave full employment o her marine. Fifty frigates, and lesser vessels, would completely blockade every port in the United States and destroy all our commerce as wel as privateering. Great Britain has now 700 ships of war, and could increase them at pleasure.

What would then become of our 700 dul sailing letters of marque and reprisal? And from what source should we be better supplied with foreign articles than at present? No---This reasoning will not do for New England. We can see but one possible benefit resulting from this southern plan of fitting out our merchant ships as privateers, and that is getting rid of the clamours and expense of 60,000 starving seamen, who would be thrown upon us by a war.

PACIFICUS.

From the Boston Repertory.

Though the note from the Norfolk Ledger, inserted in our last, accounts for the contradictory stories which have been circulated, as to the vessel from which the four Chesapeake men deserted, and their description, it may not be amiss, in order to remove erroneous impressions, to state the principal facts of several cases which have recently occurred in one view.

Some time near the close of last year, a British cruiser put officers and a number of sailors on board an American vessel at sea, and ordered her to Halifax. The British sailors joined with the Americans on board, rose upon the officers, and brought the vessel into the United States. Application was made by Mr. Erskine to our government, for a surrender of the British sailors, charged with mutiny, piracy, and an attempt to murder their officers. The reply was, that *neither the law nor the practice of nations imposed on them an obligation to provide for the surrender of fugitives from the jurisdiction of other powers.* The men were not delivered up.

After this, four men, belonging to the British cruiser Halifax, lying below Norfolk, within the limits of our jurisdiction, were sent in one of her boats, on duty, with an officer. They rose upon the officer, and having secured him, made their escape. Went directly up to Norfolk, and were entered on board the Chesapeake by the recruiting lieutenant, Sinclair. Their own officers pursued them; designated, identified, and demanded the men of lieut. Sinclair, who referred to captain Decatur; captain Decatur declined interfering, as lieut. Sinclair was acting under another captain. Application was then made to the civil authority, but they were still refused. Of these men but *one* pretended to be an American, and we do not learn that *he* gave any evidence of his citizenship.

About the same time the four men who have been the most conspicuous in the subsequent dispute, deserted from the Melampus. It appears they did not mutiny. They took one of her boats, rowed ashore; went up to Norfolk, and shipped likewise for the Chesapeake. These men said they were American citizens, and the public have the account which *three* gave of themselves. It has not yet been ascertained that more than one of those accounts was false—the native of Westport.

Mr. Erskine again applied to government, to authorize the delivering up of these eight men. He was referred to the written reply given by Mr. Madison in the former case—that our government could not surrender fugitives from the jurisdiction of other powers, for any crime, nor under any circumstances whatever.

The reader will observe here, an evasion of a most disingenuous nature, very unworthy the Secretary of State, and manifesting a provoking unfriendliness towards the British nation in a point of the utmost consequence to her. The mutiny in the boat of the Halifax, effected by acknowledged British seamen, took place *within our own jurisdiction.* The former answer of Mr. Madison, relating to the sailors on board the American vessel at sea, therefore did not apply. But this was all the satisfaction he could obtain. All the men were withholden, and Mr. Erskine communicated a statement of these facts to Admiral Berkeley, who issued an order for taking these eight men, at sea, by force, if not surrendered on being claimed. This we believe to be a statement of facts, correct in every important particular. The ground taken by our government is that, if every sailor in the British navy will rise upon and even murder his officers, (as the treaty has expired) this country is an asylum, and will afford him *as much* protection as it can give to our own citizens.

One thing is certain, that even if the Executive power is not competent to the surrender of criminals, and we do not believe such a doctrine can be supported by the laws of nations, as it

is not supported by the principles of equity, yet the *civil authority* is competent to the delivering up men for a breach of contract. This is constantly practised in England, in our favour, towards deserters from merchantmen, and likewise in this country, towards the vessels of all nations. Why was not Mr. Erskine informed that regularly shipped British seamen, escaping to violate their contract, if pointed out, would be delivered up by civil authority? We know of no reason, but a disposition to bring matters to that serious and perilous situation in which we are now wantonly and voluntarily involved.

The miserable satellites of the executive, finding it impossible to defend his policy any longer, imagine they can silence those who point out the embarrassments which have been brought upon the country, by threatening violence, and to rob and fleece them of their property. We know that the exasperation of a few abandoned individuals would rejoice in this mode of refuting patriotic arguments. The disposition is not new. When French revolutionists endeavoured to give law to this country, and the *Concorde* lay in our harbour, a long list of the names of citizens of Boston, revolutionary patriots, but who were opposed to giving up our independence to French cut-throats, and what was no less obnoxious, were wealthy, was sent down to the *Concorde*, and stuck up on her mainmast, with what bloody intention was no secret. One of these citizens too, was told in this same denouncing Chronicle, that his name had gone to France, where he was about shipping a large property, and that it would probably be taken care of. Such is the spirit, such is the temper of that infernal crew whose impotent malice now again appears in the Chronicle.—But it will frighten nobody.—They may go on denouncing.—The number of real jacobin desperadoes among us is small.—Their haggard leader, though he has the wickedness and the malice of a Cataline, has neither the sense, the courage, nor the influence.

Repertory.

Extracts from an "Extract of a letter from the Secretary of State to James Monroe, dated 5th January, 1804," with brief remarks.

"We consider a neutral flag on the high seas, as a safe-guard to those sailing under it. Great-Britain, on the contrary, asserts a right to search for, and seize her own subjects; and, under that cover, as cannot but happen, are often seized and taken off citizens of the United States, and citizens or subjects of other neutral countries, navigating the high seas, under the protection of the American flag."

REMARK.

A neutral flag can be no protection to contraband goods. And,

"Without searching neutral ships at sea, the commerce of contraband goods cannot be prevented. THERE IS THEN A RIGHT OF SEARCHING. Some powerful nations have indeed, at different times, refused to submit to this search." "After the peace of Vervins, Queen Elizabeth continuing the war with Spain, desired the king of France to allow that all French ships on their voyage to Spain may be searched, in order to discover whether they did not carry military stores; but this was refused, as an injury to trade, and a favourable occasion to pillage." "At present, a neutral ship refusing to be searched, would from that proceeding alone be condemned as lawful prize. But to avoid inconveniences, violence, and every other irregularity, the manner of search is settled in the treaties of navigation and commerce." —*Vattel.*

Now, if a belligerent has a right to

search for and seize contraband goods, is it possible for any rational person to suppose that she would not have a right to take her *own men*, say deserters, who might be found in a neutral ship?

But, continues Mr. Secretary,

"Although Great-Britain has not yet adopted in the same latitude with most other nations the immunities of a neutral flag, she will not deny the general freedom of the high seas, and of neutral vessels navigating them, with such exceptions only as are annexed to it by the law of nations." Again,

"But no where will she find an exception to this freedom of the seas, and of neutral flags, which justifies the taking away of *any* person, *not an enemy in military service*, found on board a neutral vessel."

The right of search being granted, I cannot perceive why the belligerent should not take away his *own men*, as well as "enemies serving in war," which the secretary allows (and it is so set down in the law of nations) may be taken. These men are his property, which he has a right to take wherever found; having first proved property, and paid charges.

Mr. Madison may find, by looking at some common law-books which treat about the "rights of man," (not after the manner of Tom Paine) or "personal rights," as well as the "rights of property," (say Blackstone, for instance) that in any place into which you do not make a *tortious entry*, you have a right to take your *own*, whether sheep, horse, cow, black servant, indented apprentice, or a deserter from a regiment or a man of war. This is called recaption or reprisal. The right of entry, or, what is the same thing, the *right of search*, granted, as it is in this case, being ours, the territory into which we have entered is ours, so far as may be necessary to take from thence our own property. But writers on the laws of nations are silent on this subject. Yes, and they say nothing against a man's poisoning his own soldiers. It belonged to the French *illuminated school*, to make provisions of that kind requisite!!

Would Mr. Madison say that, provided the captain of the belligerent had boarded a neutral ship, found his watch, or a chest of clothes, stolen by one of the sailors of the neutral ship, (having gone according to rule, and the regulations made and provided for such cases) that he would have no right to reclaim his goods; but must be turned over to an action, to be brought the L—d knows where, or how, or against whom? No, he might take them, and would take them, happening to have both the power and the right. But he must not, it should seem, by taking his own men, violate our neutra lflag, our immense consequence, supported by gun-boats, when at the same time we are well assured the British men of war will submit to all that they require.

There are some things not set down, which are still law. The law of nations, as explained by all the numerous writers on the subject, cannot comprehend every possible case. Something still must be left to the laws of nature; and morality and common sense must not be entirely extinguished in the course of our *spinning*. But to proceed.

Mr. Madison says,

"Whilst they, (the British) as well as others, admit a contraband of war, by enumerating its articles, and the effect of a real blockade, by defining it

in no instance do they affirm or imply a right in any sovereign to enforce his claims to the allegiance of his subjects on board neutral vessels on the high seas. On the contrary, whenever a belligerent claim against persons on board a neutral vessel, is referred to in treaties, enemies in military service *alone* are excepted from the general immunity of persons in that situation; and this exception confirms the immunity of those who are not included in it."

There is, with Mr. Madison's leave, no great logic necessary for explaining a thing self-evident. We have shown before that belligerents have a right of entry aboard neutrals. Having obtained that *ground*, they have a claim to their *own men*. They are certainly of somewhat more consequence than contraband goods. If in the prosecution of this right they take wrong steps, they are wrong, and ought to be made responsible.

Again, says Mr. Madison,

"It will not be pretended that the sovereignty of any nation extends, in any case whatever, beyond its own dominions, and its own vessels on the high seas," &c.

We cannot perceive that this has any bearing on the question. This is it—shall a belligerent, having a right of search, a privilege to board for that purpose, for property, have a right to claim the most important of all property, his own men? Whether this be in our own dominions or not, is a matter of no consequence; having got legally on board by virtue of the right of search, can he not take his own men?

But, says Mr. Madison,

"The abuses flowing from the admission of such a right, would justify the United States in claiming and expecting discontinuance."

He might as well say that the abuses flowing from granting a commission to a justice of peace, might "justify the United States in claiming its discontinuance." Such abuses will sometimes occur. The remedy is as simple as that for any other wrong. If we should happen to have a *consul* at any port where the abused man should land, he might make an application, and would find a remedy. The proof, however, ought to be on the part of the claimant. If that could not be adduced, the neutral would have a right to retain the men. If overpowered, it would be wrong prevailing against right, for a redress of which he must take a legal course.

Mr. Madison talks about "depriving persons of the dearest rights of regular trial, to which the most inconsiderable article of property captured on the high seas, is entitled."

We would be glad to know whether a *dear* man is not as much entitled to "the *dearest* rights of regular trial," as any other *dear* article of property. We believe that what precedes will explain, but we will enlarge. The neutral ought to require proof. If the belligerent has none, and takes a man by force without proof, to be sure he is a very great wrong doer, and the remedy must be sought, and may be obtained in a proper and legal way, otherwise a war must be the consequence; for we would go to war rather than have the rights of Americans violated, and the violation sanctioned by the government of Great-Britain, or any other government.

These "dearest rights of a regular trial," with the good leave of Mr. Ma-

dison, cannot be had in civil cases, always at the time of arrest. A man may be arrested on "a suspicion of debt," or crime, or, at most, on the oath of the plff. or prosecutor. He may, however, be perfectly free of debt, and innocent of crime. He has, in most cases, when improperly dealt with, his remedy. But he can have no "regular trial" *at the time*, and in order to authorize his arrest.

We are all liable to mistakes and abuses of that kind. If, however, the wrongs which we thus suffer are refused redress, then, and not till then, have we a right to complain, and, if we can not right ourselves by force, we must submit. If a native or not naturalized American is taken from on board an English vessel, it is an unwarrantable proceeding. He has his remedy, by applying to the consul at the first port. If that is refused, he must apply to his government. If nothing can be done, he suffers as innocent men sometimes may do, and it shows that human foresight, prudence, laws, and regulations, cannot provide against every possible abuse in society.

As to what is said by Mr. M. respecting property being liable, and men not liable, it is so very foolish, that we wonder at the man who does not see through it at once.

"Whenever property found in a neutral vessel is supposed to be liable, on any grounds, to capture and condemnation, the rule in all cases is, that the question shall not be decided by the captor, but be carried before a legal tribunal, where a regular trial may be had."

The property, however, is *taken*, as the man may be, without a regular trial, and we believe the man, unless asleep, may have as good a chance to have a regular trial as the property; and damages for detention and false imprisonment would as well lie for a human being, as for a bale of goods.

Next comes a deal of the revolutionary slang.

"Can it be reasonable, then, or just, that a belligerent commander, who is thus restricted, and thus responsible, in a case of mere property of trivial amount, should be permitted, without referring to any tribunal whatever, to examine the crew of a neutral vessel, to decide the important question of their respective allegiances, and to carry that decision into instant execution, by forcing every individual he may choose into a service abhorrent to his feelings, cutting him off from his most tender connexions, exposing his mind and his person to the most humiliating discipline, and his life to the greatest danger? Reason, justice, and humanity, unite in protesting against so extravagant a proceeding."

This reasoning against the exercise of a right, because of its liability to abuse, is not very conclusive. Such things *might* happen. And on the contrary, it might happen that our ships, by *covering* British sailors at this momentous crisis, *might* cut the sinews of the British navy; expose the island to the ravages of Bonaparte; and thus break down the only remaining barrier of the civilized world.

"The evil takes a deeper dye, when viewed in its practice, as well as principles. Were it allowable that British subjects should be taken out of American vessels on the high seas, it might at least be required that the proof of their allegiance should be on the British side."

If this be correct certificate of citizenship, protections, would in all cases be unnecessary. Because the burthen

of proof being thrown on the party claiming the allegiance, the other would have no need of evidence. The party claiming an immunity, must produce his title. Besides, the facility of procuring proof of citizenship, or a protection, makes it the duty of the person who would claim the exemption, to furnish himself with the necessary evidence. This, however, must be a subject of regulation between the two governments; and if the burthen of proof was cast on the searcher, still it would not follow that a neutral flag should protect British sailors in time of war.

BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

House of Lords—June 29.

American Trade.—Lord Hawkesbury presented, by his majesty's command, the order in council, continuing the provissions of the American Intercourse Act, which expired during the recess; and gave notice, that it was the intention of his majesty's government, to propose to Parliament a bill for continuing the above act for a time to be then specified, and to propose in such bill a clause of indemnity for the advice given to his majesty to continue the provisions of the former act, after it had legally expired.

Lord Auckland stated, that the reason he did not, when in office, recommend the continuance of the act which had now expired, was the pending negociation with America----He trusted, that when the treaty which was the result of that negociation came to be discussed, it would be discussed as a treaty ratified, and he felt satisfied it would be found that every possible attention had been paid to the interests of this country. He thought it but fair now to state, that when the question of the renewal of the American Intercourse Act, came to be discussed, he should probably be of opinion, that the same reasons which before operated did not exist for the continuance of the act. One part of it, in particular, he objected to, and did object to during the negociation; he alluded to that part of it which allowed to the Americans a carrying trade between our possessions in the East Indies and Europe.

House of Commons----June 29.

America.—Lord Temple said, that seeing the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his place, he would beg leave to ask him a question----In the course of the last session it had fallen to his lot to bring in a bill, which had been passed contrary to the opinions of those who composed the present administration, he meant the American Intercourse bill; and he wished to know if the present ministers meant to move for its repeal?

Mr. Rose said, that he for one had strenuously opposed the bill alluded to during its progress through the house, because he disapproved the measure; but as it had received the approbation of the house, and passed into a law, he did not think it would be decent to move its repeal till its operation was somewhat better known.

* * *June* 30.

Foreign and British Shipping.—Mr. Eden rose, in pursuance of his notice, to make a motion relative to this subject. This he prefaced by a speech of considerable length, stating the subject he had in view to be to show the prosperity and increase of our navigation, while the country was under the management of the late administration. One great cause to which the decline of British navigation was ascribed, was the passing of the bill called the American Intercourse Bill, which had been represented as a wanton innovation----and yet, by the answer given last night, by the treasurer of the navy, he learned that ministers had no intention of repealing it, although they had alleged that it went to do for enemies what they could not do for themselves, and to resign to other nations our naval superiority. The house had been

told that the whole conduct of the late ministry was a series of concessions to neutrals, and that they were weak enough to commence a negociation during the existence of the Non-Importation Act!

Mr. Rose said, he did not rise to oppose this motion, but to state that he was at a loss to know what the honorable gentleman could possibly make out from such an accoout. The only law passed during the last session, which had any relation to this matter, was the American Intercourse Bill, and upon that subject the noble Lord opposite to him, (Lord Temple) had asked him yesterday whether ministers intended to repeal it, in consequence of the objections formerly stated to it? To this, he answered, that it was rather an important question to be determined, during the pending of a treaty with America; although he was convinced such a repeal must be of advantage to the country. During the time that bill was pending, he was convinced it would prove a mischievous bill, and he was now more confirmed in that opinion, as he could venture to say, that it actually puts this country in a worse situation than we were in before, by enabling the Americans to drive the British shipping out of the colonial trade, as the West Indian had no means of carrying his sugar to America. On these grounds, he very much doubted whether, upon a competition between British and American ships, the latter would not gain the ascendency.

Viscount Howick said there was no man more desirous than he was to cultivate the good will and friendship of America; being convinced it was for the interest of both countries; but he could not carry that desire so far as to say, that an act of parliament, detrimental to our interests, and destructive of the British colonies, should not be repealed as soon as its evil effects were discovered. If the right honorable gentlemen had experienced the inconvenience he expressed, nothing could justify him in not repealing it. The truth was, all the charges brought forward upon this head formerly, were totally unfounded, and had been only made by the present ministers, to serve their own purposes when in opposition, but which they in their consciences, could not now venture to support. Before he sat down, could not help saying a word or two respecting the conduct of another right hon. gentlemen opposite (Mr. Perceval) respecting the order of council passed in consequence of the French decree of the 21st of November. That right honorable gentleman had stated that he thought then, as he seemed still to think, the measures of the last administration wholly inadequate to the purposes intended; and if so, why did he not now take upon himself to advise his majesty, to correct the spiritless measure? Was not that decree just as much in force against this country, as it was when he first objected to it? The whole conduct of the present ministers manifestly showed, that they do not believe what they themselves formerly said when in opposition.

Mr. Rose repeated, that so far from repealing the American Intercourse Bill, he would rather, under existing circumstances, advise its renewal.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer rose, he said, not for the purpose of prolonging this discussion. He did still continue to lament, that the measure which the late government had thought proper to adopt at that time, when the violent decree of France respecting neutrals was passed, was not met in a manner more efficacious; but still he did not conceive that this would be a proper or convenient time to make any alteration in it.

From the COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER.

A few days since, we published an "extract of a letter from a gentlemen in Virginia to his friend in this city, containing the following paragraph:—

"Within a few days previous to that outrage, two gentlemen of great respectibility and of unquestionable veracity, waited on the President to

pay their respects to him—his conversation astonished them both. He expressed his persuasion that the people of the United States were zealous for a war with Britain. When enquiry was made concerniug the means of waging hostillity with any prospect of success, the answer was, "*France has ships and we have seamen.*"

This paragraph has been quoted into the Baltimore American, and its truth thus denied by the editor—

"From the first moment that we saw the article, we were decidedly of opinion that it was altogether a fabricated story. We now feel ourselves authorized to say, that the first propagator of this foul calumny on the President, is an *Anglo*-American merchant, engaged in a mercantile concern in this city, who first broached it at the house of a notorious *English partizan* resident here, and which partizan at the very time gave for a toast—"*King George and the British Empire.*"

"The *Anglo*-American merchant who first circulated the story, went on from this city to New-York; and the probability is, that he there communicated to the anti-republican papers, the extract of a letter which is the subject of these strictures; and that he is the very identical gentlemen who is falsely represented as residing "near Norfolk, Virginia."

As the extract of a letter in question, was originally published in our paper, we feel ourselves compelled to notice this denial. We therefore declare, unequivocally, that, as to the letter which appeared in the Commercial Advertiser, there is not a syllable of truth in the ingenious and imposing explanation of the Baltimore editor; and we also declare,

That the letter was written by a native American;

By a citizen of Virginia;

By a gentleman whose veracity has never been questioned;

Whose public station shows him to have long possessed the confidence and esteem of his fellow-citizens:

That the gentlemen on whose authority the declarations of Mr. Jefferson are given, are American citizens; that they live in the neighbourhood of the author of the letter, and are men of great respectability and unquestionable veracity;—

That the letter was conveyed to this place by a native citizen of New-York;

And that no link in the chain of the story depends on the veracity of any "Anglo-American merchant," or any "notorious British partizan."

Knowing these facts, we did believe, and we still do believe, that Mr. Jefferson made the declarations stated in the letter; and it will require something more than the speculations of any editor to shake our belief.

We have looked in vain to the National Intelligencer for an authentic disavowal of the alleged conversation. If Mr. Jefferson never uttered the declarations attributed to him, let him promptly and explicitly deny the allegation. The importance of the subject to himself and his country will justify the measure.

EXIT OF THE INSPECTOR.

"*I have no design to gratify pride by submission, nor malice by lamentation; nor think it reasonable to complain of neglect from those whose regard I never solicited.*"

JOHNSON.

The "inevitable hour," which speedily overtakes, in Columbia's "happy land," every publication which aspires to any character for literature, science, or general information, above that of a common daily advertising newspaper, has put a period to the Weekly Inspector.

The Editor was induced to commence this publication in consequence of the suggestions of some friends whom he respected, and from a hope that his labours might have some tendency to the public good; might possibly awaken and alarm our political sentinels; and thus prevent the awful, and, we fear, inevitable fate which awaits the nation.

Although he may have failed in his designs, his motives, at least, ought to be ap-

preciated. Perhaps nothing but remediless public calamity will arouse us, and when we awake, it will be too late to escape impending destruction.

His principal object, in all his lucubrations, has been to persuade Americans that they were standing on a precipice—just on the brink—That they were in danger of soon being as Prussia is.

All minor considerations ought at this time to be merged in the great question of what shall be done to save the nation from desolation impending? Some of our politicians once thought that Prussia would oppose a barrier Where is she? Russia was likewise to have put a stop to the progress of Bonaparte But no. She is gone, or a-going

It is to us amazing that, after the proofs which we have had of *our* head-quarters being infected, *poisoned*, we are still supporting those who are supporting Mr. Jefferson.

The question is, will you, Americans, or will you not, be a nation? If you will, you must not trust to Duane, Cheetham, and some others. If you will not be a nation, let us lie down together, and do not expose an individual or two to bear the brunt, and to fall alone and unsupported.

We have much more to say for which we have not room; and if we were to give all that we have in mind on this subject, what we say would most probably be read by few, and have but little effect.

The Editor finds it impossible, in consequence of his sudden fall, to take the notice which he would otherwise have done, of the contributions of his correspondents. The numbers under the signature of "The Monitor," those entitled "Demagogue-hunting," & those written by Dr. CAUSTIC, are his own. He has received contributions from his friends for the most of whom he has expressed his gratitude: and to all of whom he would now tender his best acknowledgments.

It is not impossible, but that the Editor may, hereafter, again resume his pen. But it must be under more *stable auspices*, and he must be sure at least of something like a tolerable support.

Foreigners have, universally, and I fear, justly reproached Americans, for the little attention they have paid to literary exertions, or to the monitions of intellect. We hope Americans will not continue to deserve such reproaches But let A. have a hogshead of Molasses to advertise, and B. an elegant Essay, and we should be glad to know which would find the most ready insertion in our newspapers.

There is another fault. Our good men think that an Editor must write—write—write well if he can, but at any rate write. They measure his brains by the yard He that will turn out the greatest quantity of matter in a given time, is the greatest man. No matter, whether new or old, but something which the majority have not before seen. The man who thinks correctly; writes slowly. He does not dash like a Duane, nor tell us how to fill up, and spoil a harbour, like Cheetham.

Horace's poet, who could write, I forget how many lines, while he could stand on one leg, would be the man, of all men, for an editor of an American newspaper. Americans look at the quantity, and not the quality. Give us so much of something, and we will call you a great man. Write us sixteen pages a week of original matter, no matter how much was stolen, and we will set you on the top of a liberty-pole.

Our good Americans do not yet know how to appreciate the labours of literary and scientific men. Great-Britain owes her existence to such men. There have been instances of men in England, who were literary men having suffered. But their sufferings were generally owing to their own imprudence. Johnson, Addison, Pope, Goldsmith, ALL commanded cash for their productions, and no small sums. But putting the case that we had one or each or all of them in America, they would *starve*, and Captain Cheetham would be our first man.

Some of our sagacious men say that literary and scientific men ought not to revile the country which supports them. But the truth is, that literary and scientific men *support the country*. America is under obligations to them. The man whose head is a council, is of more value than he whose arm is a host.

The editor has spoken his mind without ceremony, but generally not without investigation, and attempting to be in some measure acquainted with his subject. He has not, perhaps, always written what would be approved by all those who call themselves Federalists. He has, nevertheless, had no unfriendly, dishonourable, nor mercenary motive. He has not attended to minutiæ in our state politics, in consequence of his faculties being overwhelmed by the dreadful phenomena of French domination. The numbers with the signature "Monitor," were written by the editor, with a hope that they would be thought worthy of more attention than they have met. But his career as a political writer is probably finished, at least suspended for the present.

XUM

BY MR. DAVY.

LO! o'er the earth the kindling spirits pour
The flames of life, that bounteous Nature gives;
The limped dew becomes the rosy flower;
Th' insensate dust awakes, and moves and lives.

All speaks of change: the renovated forms
Of long forgotten things arise again.
The light of suns, the breath of angry storms,
The everlasting motions of the main;

These are but engines of th' Eternal will,
The One Intelligence; whose potent sway.
Has ever acted, and is acting still,
Whilst stars, and worlds, and systems, all obey:

Without whose power, the whole of mortal things
Were dull, inert, an unharmonius band;
Silent as are the harp's untuned strings,
Without the touches of the Poet's hand.

A sacred spark, created by His breath,
Th' immortal mind of man his image bears;
A spirit living midst the forms of death,
Oppress'd, but not subdued by mortal cares—

A germ, preparing in the Winter's frost,
To rise and bud and blossom in the spring;
An unfledg'd eagle by the tempest tost,
Unconscious of his future strength of wing:—

The child of trial, to mortality
And all its changeful influences given:
On the green earth decreed to move and die;
And yet by such a fate prepar'd for Heaven.

Soon as it breathes, to feel the mother's form
Of orbed beauty, through its organs thrill;
To press the limbs of life with rapture warm,
And drink of transport from a living rill:

To view the skies with morning radiance bright,
Majestic mingling with the Ocean blue,
Or bounded by green hills, or mountains white;
Or peopled plains of rich and varied hue;

The nobler charms astonish'd to behold
Of living loveliness, to see it move,
Cast in Expressions rich and varied mould,
Awakening sympathy, compelling love:

The heavenly balm of mutual hope to taste,
Soother of life; affection's bliss to share,
Sweet as the stream amidst the desert waste,
As the first blush of arctic daylight fair:—

To mingle with its kindred, to descry
The path of power—in public life to shine;
To gain the voice of popularity;
The idol of to-day, the man divine:—

To govern others by an influence strong
As that high law which moves the murm'ring main;
Raising and carrying all its waves along,
Beneath the full-orb'd Moon's meridian reign:

To scan how transient is the breath of praise;
A Winter's Zephyr trembling on the snow,
Chill'd as it moves; or as the Northern rays,
First fading in the centre, whence they flow:—

To live in forests mingled with the whole
Of natural forms, whose generations rise
In lovely change, in happy order roll
On land, in ocean, in the glittering skies:—

Their harmony to trace—Th' Eternal Cause
To know in love, in reverence to adore—
To bend beneath the evitable law,
Sinking in death; its human strength no more:—

Then, as awak'ning from a dream of pain,
With joy its mortal feelings to resign;
Yet all its living essence to retain,
Th' undying energy of strength divine:—

To quit the burdens of its earthly days,
To give to Nature all her borrow'd powers;
Ethereal fire to feed the solar rays,
Ethereal dew to gland the earth in showers.

Published for THOMAS GREEN FESSENDEN, at E. SARGEANT'S Bookstore, No. 39, Wall-street, opposite the U. S. Bank.
PRINTED BY HOPKINS AND SEYMOUR, AT WASHINGTON'S HEAD.

XUM